

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY
JUN 14 2019
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By DIANNE HYATT
Deputy

Michael Freund SBN 99687
Michael Freund & Associates
1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: (510) 540-1992
Facsimile: (510) 540-5543

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

Ann G. Grimaldi SBN 160893
Grimaldi Law Offices
535 Mission Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 463-5186
Facsimile: (415) 358-4467

Attorney for Defendant
SUPERIOR LABS, LLC

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
CENTER, INC., a California non-profit
corporation

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUPERIOR LABS, INC.; SUPERIOR
LABS, LLC; SUPERIOR SUPPLEMENT
MANUFACTURING INC.; and DOES 1-
100

Defendants.

CASE NO. RG18925134

STIPULATED CONSENT
JUDGMENT

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*

Action Filed: October 18, 2018

Trial Date: None set

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On October 18, 2018, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint")

1 pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq.*
2 (“Proposition 65”), against Superior Labs, Inc.; Superior Labs, LLC; Superior Supplement
3 Manufacturing Inc. and Does 1-100. In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products
4 manufactured, distributed, or sold by Superior Labs, Inc., Superior Labs, LLC, and Superior
5 Supplement Manufacturing Inc. contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a
6 carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and expose consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a
7 Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a “Covered
8 Product” or collectively as “Covered Products”) are: (1) SuperiorLabs Neem Leaf 100%
9 Natural Pure and Potent and (2) SuperiorLabs Maca 100% Natural Pure and Potent.

10 **1.2** ERC and Superior Labs, LLC (“Superior Labs”) are hereinafter referred to
11 individually as a “Party” or collectively as the “Parties.”

12 **1.3** ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other
13 causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of
14 hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees,
15 and encouraging corporate responsibility.

16 **1.4** For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, Superior Labs does not dispute that it
17 has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a “person in
18 the course of doing business” within the meaning of Proposition 65. Superior Labs manufactures,
19 distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.

20 **1.5** The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC’s Notice of Violation
21 dated July 20, 2018 that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers,
22 and Superior Labs (“Notice”). A true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice dated July 20,
23 2018 is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days
24 have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and
25 Superior Labs and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Superior
26 Labs with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

27 **1.6** ERC’s Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes
28 persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation

1 of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Superior Labs denies all material
2 allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.

3 **1.7** The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle,
4 compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.
5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute or
6 be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of their respective officers,
7 directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees,
8 licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact, issue of law, or
9 violation of law.

10 **1.8** Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall
11 prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any
12 current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.

13 **1.9** The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as
14 a Judgment by this Court.

15 **2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become
17 necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter
18 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction
19 over Superior Labs as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda
20 County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final
21 resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have
22 been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

23 **3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS**

24 **3.1** Beginning on the Effective Date, Superior Labs shall be permanently enjoined
25 from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of
26 California," or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Products which expose a
27 person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day unless it
28 meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.

1 **3.1.1** As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State
2 of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in
3 California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Superior Labs knows will sell the
4 Covered Product in California.

5 **3.1.2** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure
6 Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:
7 micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the
8 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings
9 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on
10 the label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no
11 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

12 **3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings**

13 If Superior Labs is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, one of the
14 following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

15 **OPTION 1**

16 **WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including lead which is
17 [are] known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other
reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food.

18 For Option 1, Superior Labs shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning if Superior Labs
19 has reason to believe that the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as
20 determined pursuant to the testing and quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4 or if
21 Superior Labs has reason to believe that another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may
22 require a cancer warning.

23 **OPTION 2**

24 Superior Labs may elect to use the one of the following short form Warnings which is
25 applicable based whether the Warning must be for cancer, reproductive harm or both:

26 ⚠ **WARNING:** Reproductive Harm - www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

27 ⚠ **WARNING:** Cancer - www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

28 ⚠ **WARNING:** Cancer and Reproductive Harm - www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

1 For Option 2, the entire Warning must be in a type size no smaller than the largest type size
2 used for other consumer information (as defined in 27 Cal. Code Regs. 25600.1 (2019)) on the
3 product. In no case shall the Warning appear in a type size smaller than 6-point type. Further, for
4 Option 2, a symbol consisting of a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a
5 bold black outline shall be placed to the left of the text of the Warning, in a size no smaller than the
6 height of the word "WARNING." Where the sign, label or shelf tag for the product is not printed
7 using the color yellow, the symbol may be printed in black and white. If OEHHA promulgates
8 regulations modifying the text for the short form warning for foods, Superior Labs may implement
9 such text without being deemed in breach of this Consent Judgment.

10 Regardless of whether Option 1 or Option 2 is used, the Warning shall be securely affixed
11 to or printed upon the container or label of each Covered Product. If the Warning is provided on
12 the label, it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In addition,
13 for any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall appear on the checkout page
14 when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product. An
15 asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which products on the checkout
16 page are subject to the Warning.

17 The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety
18 warnings also appearing on its website or on the label or container of Superior Labs' product
19 packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No
20 statements intended to or likely to have the effect of diminishing the impact of, or reducing the
21 clarity of, the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning. Further, no
22 statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed chemical
23 has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

24 Superior Labs must display the Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with
25 other words, statements or designs on the label or container, or on its website, if applicable, to
26 render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary
27 conditions of purchase or use of the product.

28 ///

1 **3.3 Conforming Covered Products**

2 No warnings under Section 3.2 shall be required for Conforming Covered Products. A
3 Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is
4 no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the testing and quality control
5 methodology described in Section 3.4.

6 **3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology**

7 **3.4.1** Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, for Covered Products
8 that Superior Labs deems Conforming Covered Products under Section 3.3, as established by
9 laboratory testing that meets the quality control methodology described in Section 3.4, for
10 which no Warning under Section 3.2 is provided, Superior Labs shall cause lead testing of the
11 Conforming Covered Products to be undertaken at least once a year for a minimum of five
12 consecutive years by causing testing of five (5) randomly selected samples of each of the
13 Conforming Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which Superior
14 Labs intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in
15 California or "Distributing into the State of California." If tests conducted pursuant to this
16 Section during each of five consecutive years demonstrate that the Conforming Covered
17 Product meets the lead level standard set forth in Section 3.3 above, then the testing
18 requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Conforming Covered Product.
19 However, if during or after the five-year testing period, Superior Labs causes or knowingly
20 accepts changes of the ingredient suppliers for any of the Conforming Covered Products and/or
21 causes or knowingly accepts reformulation of any of the Conforming Covered Products,
22 Superior Labs shall cause such Conforming Covered Product to be tested annually for at least
23 four (4) consecutive years after such change is made.

24 **3.4.2** For purposes of measuring the "Daily Lead Exposure Level," the
25 arithmetic mean of the lead detection results of the five (5) randomly selected samples of the
26 Conforming Covered Products will be controlling.

27 **3.4.3** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a
28 laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate

1 for the method used, including limit of detection, qualification, accuracy, and precision that
2 meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS")
3 achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg or any other testing
4 method subsequently agreed to in writing by the Parties.

5 **3.4.4** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an
6 independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory
7 Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the
8 United States Food & Drug Administration.

9 **3.4.5** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Superior Labs' ability to
10 conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including
11 the raw materials used in their manufacture.

12 **3.4.6** Within thirty (30) days of ERC's written request, Superior Labs shall
13 deliver lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Notwithstanding the foregoing,
14 ERC's right to obtain any particular lab report under this subsection shall expire two years after
15 the date such lab report is conducted.

16 **3.4.7** Superior Labs shall comply with the Warning requirements of Section 3.2
17 for Covered Products that Superior Labs does not deem Conforming Covered Products or that
18 fail to qualify as Conforming Covered Products.

19 **4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT**

20 **4.1** In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments,
21 attorney's fees, and costs, Superior Labs shall make a total payment of \$68,000.00 ("Total
22 Settlement Amount") to ERC within five (5) days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). Superior
23 Labs shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's account, for which ERC will give
24 Superior Labs the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be
25 apportioned as follows:

26 **4.2** \$17,070.80 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and
27 Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$12,803.10) of the civil penalty to
28 the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe

1 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety
2 Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$4,267.70) of the civil penalty.

3 **4.3** \$3,536.25 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable
4 costs incurred in bringing this action.

5 **4.4** \$12,803.09 shall be distributed to ERC as an Additional Settlement Payment
6 (“ASP”), pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, sections 3203, subdivision (d) and
7 3204. ERC will utilize the ASP for activities that address the same public harm as allegedly
8 caused by Superior Labs in this matter. These activities are detailed below and support ERC’s
9 overarching goal of reducing and/or eliminating hazardous and toxic chemicals in dietary
10 supplement products in California. ERC’s activities have had, and will continue to have, a direct
11 and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers will be benefitted
12 by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to lead in dietary supplements and/or by
13 providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of the
14 products.

15 Based on a review of past years’ actual budgets, ERC is providing the following list of
16 activities ERC engages in to protect California consumers through Proposition 65 citizen
17 enforcement, along with a breakdown of how ASP funds will be utilized to facilitate those
18 activities: (1) ENFORCEMENT (65-80%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing dietary
19 supplement products that may contain lead and are sold to California consumers. This work
20 includes continued monitoring and enforcement of past consent judgments and settlements to
21 ensure companies are in compliance with their obligations thereunder, with a specific focus on
22 those judgments and settlements concerning lead. This work also includes investigation of new
23 companies that ERC does not obtain any recovery through settlement or judgment; (2)
24 VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM (10-20%): maintaining ERC’s Voluntary
25 Compliance Program by acquiring products from companies, developing and maintaining a case
26 file, testing products from these companies, providing the test results and supporting
27 documentation to the companies, and offering guidance in warning or implementing a self-
28 testing program for lead in dietary supplement products; and (3) “GOT LEAD” PROGRAM (up

1 to 5%): maintaining ERC's "Got Lead?" Program which reduces the numbers of contaminated
2 products that reach California consumers by providing access to free testing for lead in dietary
3 supplement products (Products submitted to the program are screened for ingredients which are
4 suspected to be contaminated, and then may be purchased by ERC, catalogued, sent to a
5 qualified laboratory for testing, and the results shared with the consumer that submitted the
6 product).

7 ERC shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and
8 will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are
9 being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. ERC
10 shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty (30) days of any request, copies of
11 documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

12 4.5 \$12,240.00 shall be distributed to Michael Freund as reimbursement of ERC's
13 attorney's fees, \$3,575.00 shall be distributed to Ryan Hoffman as reimbursement of ERC's
14 attorney's fees, while \$18,774.86 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except
15 as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

16 4.6 In the event that Superior Labs fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed
17 under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Superior Labs shall be
18 deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall
19 provide written notice of the delinquency to Superior Labs via electronic mail. If Superior
20 Labs fails to deliver the Total Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the written notice,
21 the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate
22 provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Superior
23 Labs agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the
24 payment due under this Consent Judgment.

25 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

26 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by
27 written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment or
28 (ii) by motion of either Party pursuant to Section 5.3 or 5.4 and upon entry by the Court of a

1 modified consent judgment.

2 **5.2** If Superior Labs seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then
3 Superior Labs must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC
4 seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC
5 must provide written notice to Superior Labs within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of
6 Intent. If ERC notifies Superior Labs in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer,
7 then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties
8 shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent
9 to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed
10 modification, ERC shall provide to Superior Labs a written basis for its position. The Parties
11 shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any
12 remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different
13 deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

14 **5.3** In the event that Superior Labs initiates or otherwise requests a modification
15 under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application for a
16 modification of the Consent Judgment, Superior Labs shall reimburse ERC its costs and
17 reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and
18 arguing the motion or application, not to exceed \$10,000.

19 **5.4** Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or
20 application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek
21 judicial relief on its own. In any such contested court proceeding, ERC may seek costs and any
22 attorney's fees incurred in opposing the motion in accordance with the requirements of
23 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

24 **6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT**
25 **JUDGMENT**

26 **6.1** This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or terminate
27 this Consent Judgment.

28 **6.2** If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Conforming

1 Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall
2 inform Superior Labs in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information
3 sufficient to permit Superior Labs to identify the Covered Products at issue. Superior Labs
4 shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from
5 an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4,
6 demonstrating Superior Labs' compliance with the Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first
7 attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

8 **7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

9 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their
10 respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries,
11 divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), Online Marketplace Hosts
12 (an entity that hosts an online marketplace but that never purchases, directly sells or has physical
13 possession of the products sold through its online marketplace), distributors, wholesalers, retailers,
14 predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to any
15 Covered Product which is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which
16 is not used by California consumers.

17 **8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED**

18 **8.1** This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC,
19 on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Superior Labs and its respective officers,
20 directors, shareholders, members, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions,
21 suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Superior
22 Labs), Online Marketplace Hosts, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and
23 downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors,
24 successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"). ERC, on behalf of
25 itself and in the public interest, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from
26 any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties,
27 fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or
28 consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its

1 implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the
2 Covered Products regarding lead up to and including the Effective Date.

3 **8.2** ERC on its own behalf only, and Superior Labs on its own behalf only,
4 further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or
5 statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition
6 65 in connection with the Notice and Complaint up through and including the Effective Date,
7 provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to
8 enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

9 **8.3** It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts
10 alleged in the Notice and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be
11 discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Superior Labs on behalf of itself only,
12 acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such
13 claims up through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefor. ERC
14 and Superior Labs acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may
15 include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any
16 such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

17 A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE
18 CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO
19 EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE
20 RELEASE AND THAT IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE
21 MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE
22 DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

21 ERC on behalf of itself only, and Superior Labs on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and
22 understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code
23 section 1542.

24 **8.4** Superior Labs' compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be
25 deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any Released Party regarding alleged
26 exposures to lead in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice and Complaint.

27 ///

28 ///

1 8.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or
2 environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Superior
3 Labs' products other than the Covered Products.

4 **9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS**

5 In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be
6 unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

7 **10. GOVERNING LAW**

8 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in
9 accordance with the laws of the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, and
10 as a result of such repeal the Covered Products are no longer subject to Proposition 65, then
11 Superior Labs shall have no further obligation as to the injunctive terms pursuant to this Consent
12 Judgment with respect to the Covered Products.

13 **11. PROVISION OF NOTICE**

14 All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall
15 be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below via first-class mail. Courtesy copies via
16 email may also be sent.

17 **FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:**

18 Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center
19 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400
20 San Diego, CA 92108
21 Ph: (619) 500-3090
22 Email: chris_erc501c3@yahoo.com

23 With a copy to:
24 Michael Freund
25 Michael Freund & Associates
26 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
27 Berkeley, CA 94704
28 Ph: (510) 540-1992
Fax: (510) 540-5543

///

///

1 **FOR SUPERIOR LABS, LLC:**

2 Eliot Rohde
3 Superior Labs, LLC
4 1389 Center Drive, Suite 200 Park City, UT 84098

5 With a copy to:
6 Ann G. Grimaldi
7 Grimaldi Law Offices
8 535 Mission Street, 14th Floor
9 San Francisco, CA 94105
10 Telephone: (415) 463-5186
11 Facsimile: (415) 358-4467

12 **12. COURT APPROVAL**

13 **12.1** Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a
14 Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this
15 Consent Judgment.

16 **12.2** If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,
17 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible
18 prior to the hearing on the motion.

19 **12.3** If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have
20 no force or effect.

21 **13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS**

22 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be
23 deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid
24 as the original signature.

25 **14. DRAFTING**

26 The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each
27 Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and
28 conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and
construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn,
and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact

1 that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any
2 portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated
3 equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

4 **15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES**

5 If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent
6 Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, and/or in
7 writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be
8 filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

9 **16. ENFORCEMENT**

10 ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda
11 County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action
12 brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs,
13 penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.
14 To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of
15 Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment,
16 but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by
17 law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

18 **17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION**

19 **17.1** This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and
20 understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all
21 prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related hereto. No
22 representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have
23 been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to
24 herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

25 **17.2** Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully
26 authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF**
2 **CONSENT JUDGMENT**

3 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The
4 Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed
5 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:


6 (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and
7 equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has
8 been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and

9 (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section
10 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

11 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**


12 Dated: 3/8/, 2019

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
CENTER, INC.

13
14 By: 
Chris Henderson, Executive Director

15
16 Dated: 3/13, 2019


SUPERIOR LABS, INC.

17
18 By: 
19 Its: Elliot Rohde, CEO

20
21 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

22 Dated: 3/14/, 2019

MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES

23
24 By: 
25 Michael Freund
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental
27 Research Center, Inc.
28

1 Dated: March 14, 2019

GRIMALDI LAW OFFICES

2 By: Ann D. Grimaldi

3 Ann G. Grimaldi

4 Attorney for Defendant Superior Labs,
5 LLC

6
7 **ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

8 Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is
9 approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.

11
12 Dated: JUNE 13, 2019

13 Deborah W. [Signature]
14 Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT A

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.540.5543

Michael Freund, Esq.

Ryan Hoffman, Esq.

July 20, 2018

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violators identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violators identified below.

Alleged Violators. The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violators")

**Superior Labs, Inc.
Superior Labs, LLC
Superior Supplement Manufacturing Inc.**

Consumer Products and Listed Chemical. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. SuperiorLabs Neem Leaf 100% Natural Pure and Potent - Lead**
- 2. SuperiorLabs Maca 100% Natural Pure and Potent - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least July 20, 2015, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at rrhoffma@gmail.com.**

Sincerely,



Ryan Hoffman

Attachments

Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
OEHHA Summary (to Superior Labs, Inc.; Superior Labs, LLC; Superior Supplement Manufacturing Inc.; and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)
Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Superior Labs, Inc.; Superior Labs, LLC; and Superior Supplement Manufacturing Inc.

I, Ryan Hoffman, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the parties identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violators will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: July 20, 2018



Ryan Hoffman

July 20, 2018

Page 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On July 20, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY"** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Superior Labs, Inc.
9921 Carmel Mountain Road, #297
San Diego, CA 92129

Jacob Hyten
(Registered Agent for Superior Labs, Inc.)
9921 Carmel Mountain Road, #297
San Diego, CA 92129

Current President or CEO
Superior Labs, LLC
1389 Center Drive, Suite 200
Park City, UT 84098

Newpark Capital, LLC
(Registered Agent for Superior Labs, LLC)
1389 Center Drive, Suite 200
Park City, UT 84098

Current President or CEO
Superior Supplement Manufacturing Inc.
18627 Brookhurst Street, #414
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Jacob Hyten
(Registered Agent for Superior Supplement
Manufacturing, Inc.)
18627 Brookhurst Street, #414
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Current President or CEO
Superior Supplement Manufacturing Inc.
910 S Main Street
Cedartown, GA 30125

On July 20, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 20, 2018

Page 5

On July 20, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
220 S. Lassen Street
Susanville, CA 96130
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Suite C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Kathryn L. Turner, Chief Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco County
732 Brannan Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us


Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 20, 2018
Page 6

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfejd@yolocounty.org

On July 20, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on July 20, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Phyllis Dunwoody", written over a horizontal line.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 20, 2018

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda
County
1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900
Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine
County
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras
County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa
County
346 Fifth Street Suite 101
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado
County
515 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno
County
2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000
Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County
P.O. Drawer D
Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
209 West Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin
County
3501 Civic Center Drive,
Room 130
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa
County
Post Office Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced
County
550 W. Main Street
Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada
County
201 Commercial Street
Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange
County
401 West Civic Center Drive
Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer
County
10810 Justice Center Drive,
Ste 240
Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas
County
520 Main Street, Room 404
Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Diego
County
330 West Broadway, Suite
1300
San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama
County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Francisco, City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL
San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's
Office
200 East Santa Clara Street,
16th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

HAYWARD HALL OF JUSTICE

Case # RG18-925134 Case Name Environmental Research V Superior Labs

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL (C.C.P. 1013A (1), 2015.5)

My business address is 24405 Amador Street, Hayward, California 94544. I am, and was at the time the herein mentioned mailing took place, a citizen of the United States, employed in the County where said mailing occurred, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above entitled cause.


On June 14, 2019 I served the foregoing document by depositing a copy thereof, enclosed in a separate, sealed envelope, with the postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail box at Hayward, County of Alameda, California, each of which envelopes was addressed respectively as follows:

Michael Freund
Michael Freund & Associates
1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704

Ann G. Grimaldi
Grimaldi Law Offices
535 Mission Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 14, 2019, at Hayward, California.



(Signature of Declarant)